

**Amendments to the Drawings**

Applicant proposes amending Figures 4 and 5 of the drawings by changing reference numbers 39a and 39b located at the upper end of the respective drawings to reference numbers 39b and 39a, respectively. This change makes the use of reference numbers 39a, 39b consistent throughout Figures 4 and 5.

Replacement sheets of drawings incorporating the changes are enclosed.

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and reexamination of the application are requested. The specification and drawings have been amended. Claim 1 has been amended. Claims 4-12 have been added. Claims 1-12 are pending.

**Amendments**

The specification has been amended to improve its form. Due to the number of amendments made, a substitute specification is enclosed, along with a marked-up copy showing the changes. No new matter has been added.

Figures 4 and 5 of the drawings have been revised to correct the use of reference numerals 39a and 39b. Replacement sheets of drawings incorporating the changes are enclosed.

The amendments to claim 1 are supported by the original disclosure, for example Figures 4 and 5. No new matter has been added.

New claims 4-6 are supported by the original disclosure, for example Figures 4-6.

New claims 7-12 are supported by the original disclosure, for example claims 1-3 and Figures 4-6.

**Specification objections**

The specification is objected to for the reasons made of record. The specification has been amended where appropriate to address the concerns of the Examiner. Withdrawal of the objections is requested.

**35 USC 112, second paragraph, rejection**

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In claim 1, "the time of collision" has been changed to "a time of collision" as suggested by the Examiner. In addition, the language "or extends" has been deleted. New claim 7 recites the "extends" language. Further, the air bag is now recited as having a polygonal shape. The claims are definite. Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**Prior art rejections**

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kosugi (US 5,498,031) in view of Amamori (US 6,502,858).

In addition, claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fukuda et al. (US 6,962,366).

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Kosugi and Amamori do not teach or suggest an air bag system as recited in claim 1 where the restricting members overlap with each other and are fixed to the retainer. With this construction, the restricting members are securely fixed to the retainer, and the portions of the restricting members that are fixed to the retainer can remain fixed to the retainer when the restricting members break.

Kosugi discloses an air bag that includes a plurality of lugs 44 around the air bag. However, as shown in Figures 2 and 4 of Kosugi, the lugs 44 do not overlap with each other when the air bag is folded.

Amamori discloses an air bag that utilizes tearable straps to control expansion of the air bag. However, the straps of Amamori do not overlap with each other.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is patentable over Kosugi and Amamori.

Claims 2 and 3, and new claims 4-6, depend from claim 1 and are patentable for that reason alone and need not be separately distinguished.

New claims 7-12 are patentable over Kosugi and Amamori. As discussed above, neither reference teaches or suggests restricting members that overlap with each other.

With respect to Fukuda et al., a verified English translation of the priority document is enclosed, thereby perfecting Applicant's priority claim. Since Applicant has priority back to April 22, 2003, which is prior to the filing date of the Fukuda reference, Fukuda is removed as prior art.